

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| STACEY M. LITTLETON, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | Case No. 3:18-cv-00590 |
| v. |) | |
| |) | JUDGE CAMPBELL |
| SIGMA ADVANCE SOLUTIONS, |) | MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRENSLEY |
| INC. et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

ORDER


Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation from the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 32), recommending that the Court grant Defendants’ Second Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Prosecute and Failure to Comply with Court Orders (Doc. No. 27). Plaintiff did not respond to the motion. The Magistrate Judge noted the multiple opportunities Plaintiff has had to respond to discovery requests and found that “Plaintiff’s repeated failures to respond to the outstanding discovery establish willfulness, bad faith and fault on the part of the Plaintiff” and “prejudice the Defendants in terms of their ability to adequately defend against Plaintiff’s claims.” (Doc. No. 32 at 4).

The Report and Recommendation advised the parties that any objections to the Magistrate Judge’s findings were to be filed within fourteen days of service (Doc. No. 32 at 5). The Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 32) and concludes that it should be adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 27) is **GRANTED** and the above captioned case is **DISMISSED**.

This Order shall constitute the final judgment in this case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

It is so **ORDERED**.



WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE